NEW YORK JOURNAL.

W. R. HEARST.

162 NASSAU STREET, NEW YORK.

WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 2, 1896.

Entered in the Post Office in New York as second-class matter.

SUBSCRIPTION RATES.

DAILY AND SUNDAY, Per Month.....40
DAILY AND SUNDAY, Per Year.....$4.50
DAILY, Without Sunday, Per Month.....30
DAILY, Without Sunday, Per Year.....$3.00
SUNDAY, Alone, Per Year.....$1.50

Three times the above rates in all foreign countries, except Mexico and Canada.

In order to secure attention, subscribers wishing their addresses changed must give their old as well as new address.

Persons desirous of organizing clubs of subscribers for the New York Journal will receive full information concerning special rates, etc., by addressing "Circulation Department, the New York Journal, New York."

THE WEATHER.

Official forecasts for to-day indicate fair weather; warmer.

It looks as if the Sultan might be compelled to take down his "The Public Be D——d" motto.

Possibly Mr. Harrison's plea for more revenue means that he is really sorry that he signed the McKinley bill.

As a papier mache reproduction of a national convention, the Indianapolis gathering is a reasonable success.

After a visit to Buzzard's Bay Hon. Don M. Dickinson has returned to Michigan with his Democracy on crooked.

The man who is always guided by precedent manages to score a great many failures during the period of his existence.

Li Hung Chang has sent his coffin back to China, but General Weyler continues to insist that he has a trocha in Cuba.

England was not so much alarmed over the financial agitation in this country as to prevent her executing the Zanzibar grab.

The next time Hamid Bin Thwain Bin Said has an opportunity to reign he will refrain from placing the lighted end of the situation in his mouth.

King Menelek is the possessor of $7,000,000 worth of jewelry, enough to equip an army of hotel clerks and then have enough left to advertise several hundred actresses.

Now that the college men are going into active football training, it will be rather difficult for Messrs. Corbett, Sharkey, Fitzsimmons et al. to monopolize the attention of the public.

The other fellows may have the precedents, but as Addicks has the pocketbook and can put up a robust campaign fund, he will receive the recognition of Mr. Hanna's committee.

Perhaps it is just as well that Senator Thurston should make war on "free trade" for the balance of the campaign. He has shown himself incapable of dealing with the issues of the day.

TROUBLE AT INDIANAPOLIS.

We note with grave regret that marked differences of opinion have already made their appearance among the delegates to the national convention of Hannacrats at Indianapolis. This is as deplorable as it was unexpected. The call for the convention specifically enumerated the convictions which everybody intending to participate in the gathering must profess, and for delegates to turn up at Indianapolis now with demands for such heretical legislation as an income tax or opposing the extension of the national banking system is execrably un-Hannacratic. It is to be feared that when the convention is over the gentlemen who find themselves in the minority will hasten back to their States and begin earnest work to put a real, true Hannacratic ticket in the field, that the nation may be saved the ignominy and shame, etc., etc. (For particulars see the call for the Indianapolis Convention itself.)

How curious a thing it is, though, that to this convention of dissatisfied Democrats gathered to do the work of Mark Hanna there should go any with expectation of lessening in any degree the tribute it will pay to plutocracy. The press dispatches say that men will be there from the South demanding an income tax plank. They might as well send a lamb into the midst of a pack of wolves to preach the civilizing effects of a vegetarian diet. The men who organized the Indianapolis Convention are men who are bitterly opposed to an income tax, because they would have to pay it—or lie out of it. They prefer high tariff taxes, which they do not have to pay, and for this reason strive to elect McKinley, who has reduced the art of taxing the poor for the benefit of the rich to a science.

Again, it appears that dissension has sprung up over the money plank of the platform. The delegates from the Northeast desire at Indianapolis, as they desired at Chicago, to complete the work of contraction of the currency, begun by striking down silver, by compelling the retirement of the greenbacks and Treasury notes and increasing the national bank system. To this the Southern and Western delegates—who really must be tainted by "popocracy"—are opposed. They do not appear to understand that the national bank system is the lord of our business destinies, and that if occasionally, as in 1893 and in lesser degree now, the national bankers have forced a panic or compelled business depression, it is only because whom the Lord loveth he chasteneth. In their uncouth way these delegates to Indianapolis seem to hold that already too much power is in the hands of the national bankers, and they hope to decrease rather than increase it. They probably don't know who chose the delegates to their convention, who pays its bills, or how many national bankers are numbered among its delegates.

We will watch with some interest the outcome of this most unexpected divergence of opinion among the delegates to Indianapolis. Of course, those who are in the minority will instantly declare themselves the only original Hannacrats and hold a convention of their own. If they don't they will deprive the whole affair of its reason for existence.

THE VERMONT ELECTION.

In Vermont yesterday the Democratic State ticket sustained a crushing defeat. Josiah Grout, Republican, was elected Governor by a plurality over J. Henry Jackson, Democrat, of not less than 35,000. Never in recent years has the Republican plurality approached this figure. In 1892 the Republicans won by 19,702 and in 1888 by 28,521. This year sanguine Democrats hoped to keep the Republican plurality within 25,000. Enthusiastic Republicans prophesied it would reach 35,000. The result speaks for itself.

These facts and figures should impress themselves upon the understanding of every man, be he Democrat, Republican or Populist, who hopes for the victory of the Chicago nominees in this campaign. There portent is not to be gainsaid. Explanation of them only makes more clear the duty of every Bryan supporter.

It was active political effort that swelled the Republican vote in Vermont. With practically unlimited means, Mark Hanna was able to send his lieutenants into a State the vote of which was already assured to his candidate, and, for its mere moral effect, make such a campaign as might have been made in a doubtful State. The Democratic National Committee for its part, confronted at all times by lack of funds, doubtless thought it the part of wisdom to waste neither money nor effort upon a State certainly Republican, and upon a ticket not in sympathy with the Chicago platform.

The vital lesson of the Vermont election is the evidence it gives of the resourcefulness of the Republican national machine. No point is too small for it to cover, no task too great for its capacity. Its means are ample, and its confidence, as is usual with the bearers of full purses, unbounded. The Democrats, unable for lack of the sinews of war to meet the enemy at every point, must pick the States in which the battle can be fought best with the least ammunition, and deliver their attacks there. Vermont was not one of these States. Maine, which votes four days hence, is not. But from the returns in these invariably Republican States Democrats may gain some idea of how fierce is the contest they have invited.

There is every evidence that work on Democratic lines even in nominally Republican States brings fruitful returns. The success of so young a campaigner as George Fred Williams in awakening silver sentiment in conservative Massachusetts is a thing not to be ignored. Mr. Bryan's almost triumphal progress through the central counties of New York has given the most convincing evidence possible that the people need only to be addressed to make them respond with enthusiasm. The avidity, too, with which campaign literature on the Democratic side is sought sufficiently shows how near Democracy is this year to the hearts of the people.

Let us not underestimate the significance of Vermont's election. It is twofold. It indicates surprising Republican activity and entire absence of Democratic effort. But neither let us be discouraged by it, but learn from it rather to accurately gauge the force of the enemy and to dispose our own limited resources to the best effect.

THE SYRACUSE PLATFORM.

The platform adopted at the convention of an unnamed political faction held at Syracuse yesterday begins and ends with a lie. "The Democrats of the State of New York," it says, "assembled at Syracuse adopt the following platform." As a fact, the Democrats of New York assemble at Buffalo two weeks hence. In conclusion, the Syracuse unclassed demand that "the approaching convention at Indianapolis should nominate on a Democratic platform Democratic candidates." As a matter of fact, plutocratic candidates and platform are all to be expected of it.

However, names and titles are things of the least importance in this campaign. Party lines are down, and party names may well be left to those who find their chief strength in the labels they wear. Men are to be asked to vote for Bryan not because a Democratic convention nominated him, but because he stands for the principles of Democracy which existed before the Democratic party took form. He represents Democracy as much because of his creed as because a Democratic convention nominated him. If the candidates put in nomination at Indianapolis this week should be given a really Democratic platform, a platform which stood for the rights of all men as against the privileges of a few men, it would be idle to question their essential Democracy, though we might condemn them for disloyalty to the party organization.

What promise does the Syracuse Convention give of the triumph of Democracy in the Indianapolis Convention?

An essential principle of Democracy is the right and the perfect capacity of the people to govern themselves. How far this principle found recognition at Syracuse may be judged from this excerpt from the address of the chairman of the convention, Mr. Charles S. Fairchild:

It would be very easy for many among us to remain silent. I have often said to myself: "Why trouble yourself about this? You can take care of yourself." And so I can, and most of the men that I see before me take care of themselves. But I know that the great bulk of the people of the United States cannot take care of themselves.

And so the magnanimous Fairchild and the gentlemen before him—who are certainly able to take care of themselves, if Perry Belmont, Roswell P. Flower or Edward M. Shepard are fair exemplars—proceeded to take care of the common people on the familiar principle of letting the Government care for the rich and the rich care for the poor.

Their first step in their caretaking policy was to adopt a platform, and the first words of their platform were devoted to denouncing the Chicago platform as Populistic and intended to arouse class antagonisms. But the Chicago Convention harbored no speaker who denied the capacity of the people for self-government. Its voice collectively rose in a grand chorus of assertion of the essential integrity, honor and ability of all the people—a sturdy assertion of the fundamental principles of American self-government. If Fairchild spoke for Democracy and Bryan for Populism, it is a sorry day for Democracy. But Fairchild spoke for plutocracy.

Continuing, the Syracusans announced cheerfully: "We recognize in Republican protection, by which the Federal power of taxation on imports is exercised, the mainstay of trusts, the parent of monopoly, the fruitful source of the present political dangers which threaten the nation." So declaring, they proceeded with their work of choosing delegates to a convention called to aid in the election of William McKinley, the father of protection and the protege of Mark Hanna, the Napoleon of trusts. How, in the face of its own description of McKinley's pet dogma, the Syracuse Convention could have made itself the catspaw for McKinley and still lay claim to consistency and honor passes comprehension. If the people cannot care for themselves better than Mr. Fairchild and the gentlemen he saw before him cared for their political morals the nation is in sorry state indeed.

Of the money plank in the platform, it is only necessary to say that it is a frank declaration for the gold standard, without even the sugar coating of a vague approval of "international bimetallism." And the gentlemen assembled at Syracuse out-Heroded Herod by adding to their approval of the existing and progressive contraction of the currency a demand that the process of contraction be hastened by retiring the legal tender or Treasury notes. Wall Street could scarcely have spoken more emphatically through the Clearing House Committee.

The merit of this Syracuse platform is its frankness; its demerit is its brutal indifference to everything except maintenance of the conditions which have furthered the concentration of wealth and the diffusion of poverty. But, as it seems that some of the gentlemen who formulated it have a certain feeling that it will find approval with the people, it ought to be put forth under a name of its own, and not be forced upon the voters under a fraudulent veneer of spurious Democracy.

LI AND OUR SHIPS.

It is a pity that Li Hung Chang has not thought the great fleet of American warships off Staten Island worthy of even a passing glance. When he came into port he stayed below while the St. Louis was passing the squadron. On Monday he refused to take the little trouble involved in allowing the Dolphin to run down the bay from Governor's Island, and now the fleet has been ordered to sea, and the chance of inspecting it is gone.

Thus far the only American warship that Li has seen at close quarters is the Dolphin, which is without exception the very oldest and least formidable, and with few exceptions the slowest, of all the vessels of the new navy. With two magnificent battleships of the latest type, and half a dozen cruisers and coast defence vessels unsurpassed in the world, Li Hung Chang gets his entire impression of the American navy from a dispatch boat twelve years old, the product of the first experiment ever tried in the United States in the construction of a steel ship. Things were not managed that way in England, and we are inclined to think that if the Viceroy had manifested a desire to cross the Atlantic without catching a glimpse of the British navy he would not have succeeded in doing it.

In fact, on one occasion he did attempt to rebel against the arrangements made for his entertainment—not in as serious a matter as that—and failed. A special train had been ordered to take him somewhere, and at the last moment he decided to go later. "Your Excellency will go now," remarked the functionary in charge when this decision was communicated to him, and His Excellency did.

COIN NOTES AND SILVER.

A correspondent asks a contemporary what would happen if the Secretary of the Treasury at any time should redeem coin notes in silver instead of in gold, and the editor answers:

If ever he should do so silver dollars would become at once the measure of values in this country at their bullion worth. Gold would go instantly out of use as money. We should be upon an exclusively silver basis as completely as Mexico is.

There is some ground for a reasonable difference of opinion about the effects of an unlimited coinage of silver, but there is no excuse for such a palpable misstatement as this about a thing which is not a matter of opinion, but of easily ascertainable fact. In the case submitted the coin notes would be treated as silver certificates, except that the Treasury would have the option of redeeming them in gold, while it always and necessarily redeems silver certificates in silver. Therefore they could not possibly be worth less than the silver certificates, which are now practically at par with all other forms of money.

The redemption of coin notes in silver dollars would not increase the number of those dollars in existence, and hence could not reduce their value. It would be a novelty in political economy if a coin could be depreciated by giving it an additional use, without increasing the supply.

If the Treasury should exercise its option of paying coin notes in silver it would merely be doing what the Bank of France does now, without disastrous results. That bank has fifty per cent more coin notes outstanding than the United States Government has, and it never hesitates to redeem them, whenever it finds it convenient, in silver coins worth as bullion three cents on the dollar less than ours. It furnishes gold at such times when requested, but charges a small premium for it. And yet the French bank notes have never depreciated, nor do the French 15½ to 1 coins show any symptoms of falling to their bullion value, as our contemporary asserts that our heavier ones would as soon as we adopted the French policy.

THE OUTPOURING FOR BRYAN.

The bewildering enthusiasm of Mr. Bryan's reception in Western New York, Pennsylvania and Ohio staggers the confidence of the saviors of society, who had counted on the partisan prejudices of an industrious Republican population to do the work of the trusts and the bond syndicates. A hundred thousand people gathered in Hanna's own town to greet the Democratic candidate, including 1,500 to 1,700 from the home of McKinley, form a spectacle calculated to induce thought.

Of course, most of the Eastern papers ignore this phenomenon as far as they can. To read them nobody would imagine that Mr. Bryan was making one of the most sensational tours in the history of American politics. There is an occasional exception, however. The Herald, for instance, has always made a point of printing the news in political campaigns, whether it agreed with its policy or not. In 1888, when it was supporting the Democratic ticket, it struck consternation into the party by publishing a series of dispatches that foreshadowed Cleveland's defeat. Yesterday its reports from Ohio showed that Bryan was gaining Republican votes in the Republican stronghold. "It is apparent," continued the dispatch, "that a fair proportion of the population is in sympathy with Bryan and the ideas he represents."

It is indeed, and the Herald, with the candor that is so disconcerting to the politicians, will be publishing some still more startling news before the campaign is over.

On the evening of his arrival Li Hung Chang gracefully announced through his secretary that America had delighted him "by its beauty, its power and its greatness." As he had stayed in the cabin of the St. Louis until the ship tied up to the dock, he must have gained all his impressions of the power of America from his escort of two hundred cavalrymen, of its greatness from Mr. Roosevelt's policemen, and of its beauty from the women that applauded his entry into the Waldorf. The samples were good as far as they went, but rather minute for sweeping generalizations.

"In the name of politeness and the graces," says the Chicago Tribune, "we feel called upon to protest against the practice of designating Mr. Bryan as an 'Anarchistic idiot.' Mr. Bryan is not an Anarchist." If the Tribune is not more guarded in its utterances, it will soon find itself suspected of treachery to the cause of McKinley.

AN ENGLISH FINANCIAL EXPERT

W. H. Grenfell, Bimetallist, Says if He Were American He Would Support Bryan.

Mr. W. H. Grenfell is the President of the General Council of the Bimetallic League of England. Like Arendt and Von Kardoff, in Germany, he has now abandoned the theory, hitherto generally held in Europe, that free coinage by the United States alone would injure the cause of international bimetallism, and has reached the conclusion that if America will lend the way, Europe will have to follow.

"If I were a citizen of the United States," he remarks in the following interview, "I should go about with 16 to 1 badges all over me. * * * I believe that if the system were given fair play the United States is big enough, rich enough and strong enough to maintain the par of exchange alone and to settle the ratio for the world."

"In discussing this great question with reference to the United States and England," said Mr. Grenfell, "there is one important point which should be borne in mind, and that is the fact that with us the word 'bimetallist' bears a different meaning from what it bears with you. In the United States, as I understand, a bimetallist is one who wishes the United States to adopt the bimetallic system without any international agreement with other countries—to go it alone, in fact; whereas in this country the Bimetallic League exists for the purpose of securing by international agreement a stable monetary par of exchange between gold and silver. With us bimetallism means international bimetallism; with you it means bimetallism for the United States independent of any agreement with foreign countries. This difference opens up a most momentous question: What would be the effect of the success of the bimetallic party in the United States? Or, in other words, what would be the effect on the United States and on the world generally if the United States adopted bimetallism at 16 to 1 without an international agreement with foreign countries? On this point I may at once say that I am at variance with what has hitherto been the feeling of the English Bimetallic League. The English Bimetallic League, as a league, is opposed to the policy of single handed bimetallism for the United States for two reasons—first, because they are afraid that the United States single handed may not be able to maintain the monetary par of exchange between the two metals, and so bring discredit and failure upon a system which they maintain to be sound and orthodox and thus put the whole system back, and, second, because they are afraid of seeing a gold premium in New York which would act as a protective duty against our exports there, and give them, by establishing a common medium of exchange, an advantage over us in trading with the East.

"I, personally, do not share these fears. On the contrary, I look to the United States as the one great hope of anything being done in the direction of international bimetallism. Matters in Europe are at a deadlock. This is the impression I have carried away with me after having attended the international bimetallic conferences at Paris and at Brussels. It cannot be denied that the ablest economic and financial opinion in Europe is in favor of a return to the bimetallic system of currency, the system which prevailed up to 1873, when the demonetization of silver was inaugurated, of which your great economist, Professor Francis A. Walker (who, by the way, was staying with me a few weeks ago), has said that the history of the world would be searched in vain for a political blunder of equal enormity. But, on the other hand, the impression seems to prevail that unless England will become a full partner the other countries will do nothing. Now, though I believe that England, with her Indian empire and her great Eastern trade, suffers more from the present state of things than any European country, and though I myself would like to see England adopt the bimetallic system to-morrow, I am afraid that if other countries are going to wait for England they will wait forever.

"One's thoughts, therefore, turn to the great Republic across the seas. She has the opportunity and she has the power of setting the example. It is an example which, I believe, will be speedily followed. Russia has come to the parting of the ways. She has determined to adopt a metallic basis for her money; that basis must be gold or bimetallic. She cannot afford to have a monetary system out of harmony with that of other civilized countries, and if there is no hope for silver then she must go on to gold, even though she knows that in the way she must face all the evils and dangers of a contracting monetary supply. France has already, through her Parliament, declared in favor of the bimetallic principle, and both of these countries would welcome any step which promised a definite solution of the great gold and silver question. Other countries would, I believe, soon follow. If they are going to wait for England, nothing will be done. The difficulties in the way of getting any particular ratio sanctioned by the House of Commons are insuperable. The English Bimetallic League itself is not agreed as to the ratio to be adopted.

"But, mind you, the English Government has promised a great deal. What Mr. Balfour said in the House of Commons was practically this: 'If other countries will establish a stable monetary par of exchange between gold and silver we will be prepared to reopen the Indian mints to the free coinage of silver and to make certain other concessions. We ask no questions about the ratio, though it interests us as much as or more than you. Once establish a stable ratio, at whatever figure you please, and we will support it.' This is practical politics. The Indian mints were closed without applying to the House of Commons, and they can be reopened without applying to the House of Commons, whereas, trying to pass ratios through the House of Commons is not practical politics.

"This also should be remembered, that it would in all probability do more good to the cause of silver for a well-banked country like England, with only thirty-seven millions of people, to remain on the gold standard and to open the mints of three hundred millions of people in India to the unlimited coinage of silver, than it would for the whole British Empire to become bimetallic, with India making a demand for gold for monetary purposes. This offer on the part of England is the only practical one yet made by any country, and, though it may be true that England blocks the way, it is equally true that no other country has made any offer to be compared with this one."

"Do you think that the United States would do well to return to free silver coinage, without regard to what any other country may do or may not do?" I asked.

"I do, most certainly," said Mr. Grenfell. "If I were a citizen of the United States I should go about with 16 to 1 badges all over me. I am a pretty good nuisance to my friends here about bimetallism, but over there I should be avoided like a pestilence. I believe that if the system were given fair play the United States is big enough, rich enough and strong enough to maintain the par of exchange alone and to settle the ratio for the world. Besides, I believe that other countries would soon follow her example. Anyhow, gold has been drawn from the country for some time, and it does not seem a logical way to keep one's gold by increasing one's gold indebtedness, which is apparently the 'sound money' panacea. Supposing that on the passage of a free coinage act in the United States there was a panic, and gold left the country in large quantities, and there was a gold premium in New York, what would naturally happen? The gold would come to Europe; there would be a great stimulus to the exports of the United States in consequence of the higher gold prices, and the gold would flow back naturally in the course of trade. I would much rather try to keep gold in the United States by going on to silver than by raising gold loans."

"Don't you believe that there would be a great fall in the price of railway stocks and other American securities held in Europe?"

"Well, there might certainly be a panic at first, but if the question were settled on a bimetallic basis I believe there would be a certain rise, and that there would be a period of general prosperity. The great fall in American securities took place, as I know to my cost, after the closing of the Indian mints, and my London brokers told me that when President Cleveland repealed the Silver Purchase act confidence would be restored and prices would go up again. Well, the Silver Purchase act was repealed, and the only consequence seemed to be that a large proportion of the railways went into the hands of receivers. If the United States went on to the free coinage of silver my advice would be to invest largely in 'Americans.'"

"But would there not be a fear of Europe unloading her silver in America if the United States adopted free coinage?"

"I do not think so. In the first place, as the silver of France, Germany and the Latin Union is coined at 15½ to 1, it would not go to the United States, where, at 16 to 1, it would be worth 3 per cent less. In the second place, owing to the demand for silver for miscellaneous purposes, there is very little loose silver to go. And in the third place, the delegates from Germany, France, Austria, Denmark, Belgium, Russia and England, assembled at the Brussels Bimetallic Conference, signed a resolution in which they stated that in their opinion, if the United States adopted the bimetallic system, an arrangement could be arrived at which would prevent the silver from European countries and their colonies being thrown upon the mints of the United States.

"As regards the 'fifty-cent dollar,' I think, socially and economically, a fifty-cent dollar is preferable to a 150-cent dollar, and if I am paid a dollar and can pay my debts with it, I do not much care whether it is called a fifty-cent dollar or not. But there would be no fifty-cent dollar about it. As soon as the mints were freely opened to silver there would be a great rise in its value as compared with gold. There would be a rise in the general level of prices, no doubt, but, the population and trade of the world having increased so much since 1873, it is extremely unlikely that prices would reach the level of 1873, even if silver were again freely coined."

"How long have you been a bimetallist, Mr. Grenfell?"

"Well, I think I began in my first Parliament, in 1880. Any how, in the Parliament of 1885, when I was private secretary to Sir William Harcourt, who was Chancellor of the Exchequer, I was a full-blown bimetallist, though I found my chief very unsound on the subject, and I have been growing in grace ever since. The writings of English political economic professors convinced me that the arguments of the gold monometallists were unsound, and I was confirmed by the books of Dana Horton and Francis A. Walker, from your side of the water. In those days, except in Manchester and the textile districts, bimetallists were looked upon as lunatics without sufficient sense to be dangerous. But you will see by the lists and papers I have shown you that we are a strong body at present. At the last election a good deal of work was done and bimetallism was made a question of practical politics, and influences more elections than many people are aware of. We make by far the most progress among the working classes. They have no fixed incomes from the funds and depend for their subsistence upon the prosperity of productive industries, which they now know to be in a most unhealthy condition. But the forces against us here are very strong—too strong to allow England to take the initiative—and I look with hope across the Atlantic for the most important reform, or rather redress, of modern times."

JULIAN RALPH.

A New Sport in France.

[Paris Letter, London Telegraph.]

Not content with gloating over fights in which bulls and horses are pitilessly slaughtered, our Southerners are betraying a taste for another kind of "sport" of at least equal brutality. According to intelligence received from Beaucaire, in the Department of the Gard, and replete with unedifying details, the local arenas were on Sunday crammed with spectators, who had gathered for the purpose of regaling themselves with a so-called combat between a bull and a bear. Bruin, a fine animal, had been led into the middle of the ring with a chain about thirty feet in length, and the other extremity of which had been pegged down, when the bull was quickly introduced, and rushed foaming on the unfortunate beast. A hot encounter ensued. While the bull drove its horns into its adversary's side the bear, erect on its hind legs, bit it in the neck and ears with such effect as completely to intimidate its opponent, which slunk away until it was pricked on by the toreador, when it returned to the charge, only to be beaten off again. Two other bulls were afterwards successively sent into action with a like result, but the life of the victorious bear was not to be spared, and it was dispatched in the presence of a noisy crowd with two shots fired by the professional tamer, who had sold it for the fight. Such is the extraordinary story which reaches us from Beaucaire, and the question is asked here whether the Southerners are failing as low as did the Romans of the later Empire, and whether conflicts of gladiators will yet be witnessed under the high patronage of the present government.

"An Enemy to the King."

From 1896 to 1585—from "Hully Gee!" to "Pardieu!"—from Steve Brodie and "On the Bowery" to E. H. Sothern and "An Enemy to the King," produced last night for the first time at the Lyceum Theatre, are the surprisingly agile changes made by R. N. Stephens, an American playwright. All is well that ends well. Mr. Stephens has landed comfortably this time, for a large, cultured and critical audience sat in judgment on his latest effort, presented by Mr. Daniel Frohman.

The atmosphere of Zenda clings to "An Enemy of the King." You feel it in your bones that young Sothern, elated by the success of his royal doings in Ruritania, selected a play as nearly similar in style and function as possible. Moreover, the days of romance, as I have before suggested, are here, and we are harking backward with remarkable unanimity. The new play is not a fantasy. It is a drama of love and swords, of hearts and duels, built around the conflict of the Huguenots and the Leaguers. History is invoked in order to lend picturesque tints to the amours of a Huguenot captain of the description vulgarly described as "dashing," and a lovely, trusting, conscience-freighted maiden, also one of the persecuted.

The love story is the main theme, and Mr. Stephens has made noble efforts to wring a dramatic peal from the sorrows of his Huguenot couple. The captain is very much involved in "the affairs of King." A price has been placed upon his head by the Governor of Berri, and beautiful Julie de Varian comes along in the nick of time. Her father is in prison, awaiting the agonies of torture and death. Can she save him? The Governor tells her that she can, and if you have been to the theatre a few times in the course of your life you will be able to guess how. She must tempt the Huguenot captain, play the part of Delilah to his Samson, and deliver him into the hands of the Philistines. She meets the captain, alas! only to love him. Twenty-four hours cause her fair Huguenot heart to pulsate more rapidly in his presence, and it is after she has found him dear that she discovers his identity.

The discovery of his identity occurs at the end of the second act, and during the mornings of this week Mr. Stephens must conjure up some means by which he can make his climax more effective. It needs what they call—in the jargon of the stage—"working up." Last night it fell flat, almost obscured in a needless maze of triviality and irrelevance. The story after this proceeds slowly. The villain, who is infinitely preferable in 1585 clothes to the irritating type of to-day, in tan kid gloves and immaculately creased trousers, is a vicomte who loves the heroine. It is he who betrays Julie's purpose to the Huguenot captain, and hastens on the denouement. In the third act De Launay—the captain—has become convinced that there was something in the villain's charges, and follows her to the Governor's chateau of Clochonne, where they arrive at the "witching hour." The Huguenot maiden, however, has repented of her bargain, and the effects of her repentance are shown very interestingly in the last act. Swords play a more important part in this act than any member of the cast. The episode is Mr. Stephens's piece de resistance—the only portion of the story that soars above the usual and the conventional, and the patience of last night's audience was rewarded at the eleventh hour.

"An Enemy to the King," however, suffers from a plethora of details. Mr. Stephens is too much interested in his "chorus." He forgets that we are all dying to reach that fourth act, and that we don't care so very much, after all, for King Henry of Navarre and the Duke of Guise and one or two of the distressing comedy people to whom he introduces us. There is admirable material in this play. Mr. Stephens is a playwright to whom we shall look in confidence in the future, but the action of "An Enemy to the King" must be pulled more closely together, and many of its irrelevancies must be stamped out. This young playwright has taken a step in the right direction—away from the namby-pamby-ism of the kid glove school, and acts the unfathomed recesses of history and romance.

E. H. Sothern has a role that affords him far fewer opportunities than those he glided so successfully in "The Prisoner of Zenda." There are moments when you feel that Ernanton de Launay is inclined to be cheap—that he is after all only our spick-and-span 1896 heroine-rescuer, togged in the garbs of the Huguenots. Those moments are not frequent, and perhaps they are inevitable. Rudolf Rassendylls are not knocking about the streets of New York. They are, unfortunately, very rare. Still, in the third act Sothern is able to dominate a scene, and he does it. The more I see of this actor, the more amazed I am at the remarkable progress that he has made. "Sothern can't help being good," was what I heard on all sides of me, and I believe it. There is a wonderful repression in his methods, a gentle, subdued refinement that appeals to men and women alike, and as Ernanton de Launay he forfeited no good opinions, for the play dragged when he was not there—and very often he wasn't there.

Miss Virginia Harned, owing to the illness of Miss Kimball, was the heroine. She did extremely well; in fact, as she only received the part last Thursday, she may be said to have signally distinguished herself. But why doesn't Miss Harned take proper exercise and keep her corporeal entity within the limits of grace. The unbecoming and distinctly inappropriate gown she paraded in the third act revealed proportions that no amount of gallantry could call sylph-like. The other members of the cast worked earnestly and with satisfactory results. Morton Sulten was the villain, Rowland Buckstone a boozy—and not funny—follower of the Captain, Miss Jeannette Lowrie, a chatty maid, and Ernest Tarleton, a French innkeeper with a Li Hung Chang accent.

Exquisitely staged was "An Enemy to the King." Such a production is a credit to Mr. Frohman, and to the scenic artist. For once, I scanned my programme for the name of that gentleman. He is E. G. Anlt, and that name deserves to be starred.

I hope that Mr. Stephens will peg away at romances. Let him discard Steve Brodie from his repertory of stary. Sothern can't stand divided honors. Besides, with two such stars on his list, Mr. Stephens might get mixed, and give "An Enemy to the King" play to the bridge jumper, and an "On the Bowery" effort to Sothern.

ALAN DALE.

A Political Pugilist.

[Washington Post.]

Major McKinley is disposed to adopt Fitzsimmons's tactics in reference to Mr. Bryan's challenge to a joint debate.

Good Deal of Mind.

[Detroit News.]

Possibly Senator Hill hopes to create the impression that he has a good deal of mind to make up.